

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7  
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 HAROLD H HAWKS,

10 Petitioner,

No. C 04-01822 JSW

11 v.

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE  
SUPPLEMENTAL TRAVERSE**

12 JAMES HAMLET,

13 Respondent.  
14 \_\_\_\_\_/

15 This matter comes before the Court upon consideration of petitioner's motion for an  
16 extension of time to file his supplemental traverse.

17 On August 24, 2005, the Court granted respondent leave to amend his answer but also  
18 granted petitioner leave to supplement his traverse. The Court ordered the petitioner to file his  
19 supplemental traverse within 30 days of that Order. Petitioner requests additional time to file  
20 his traverse because of what he contends is the uncertain precedential value of *Sass v. California*  
21 *Board of Prison Terms*, 376 F. Supp. 2d 975 (E.D. Cal. 2005). The Court does not find this to  
22 be sufficiently good cause to extend the briefing schedule previously ordered. Accordingly, the  
23 motion seeking a thirty day extension of time is DENIED.

24 In light of the fact that petitioner's motion was filed shortly before the deadline, the  
25 Court shall grant petitioner a short extension and his supplemental brief shall be due on  
26 Monday, September 26, 2005. There shall be no further extensions of time. If the *Sass* opinion  
27  
28

1 is de-published, petitioner may bring that fact to the attention of the Court in the form of a brief  
2 notice.

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4  
5 Dated: September 20, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEFFREY S. WHITE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California